

3.4 PLANNING EFFORT PARTICIPANTS

The following people all attended at least one meeting of the public, issue groups, work groups, or the Planning Committee:

Joe Abellere	Zahida Bashir	D o n Butchart
Femi Adeyemi	Michelle Beaumont	Diane & Harald P. Cagot
Pauline D. Adams	Sheila M. Belcher	Lorraine Calissi-Corral
Charles R. Adrianse	Priscilla Bell-Lowe	Gene Cameron
Teri & Eric Aldrich	Rosann Benedict	Samuel Cardenas
Scott Allison,	Lauren-Benson	Juan Carlos & Elizabeth
Ed Amato	Judy L. Bingham	Benedetto
Sherry Amundson	Karen L. Birchfield	Norman Carlson
Kathy Andersen	Bob Blair	Mardy Carroll
Norine Anderson	Rob Blakeley	Judi Carter
Scott W. Anderson	Bonnie Bledsoe	Louise Carter
Eve Anthony	Lila Bloch	Kimberly J.S. Caulfield
Marlin Appelwick	Brian Bodenbach	Claire Chamberlain
Larry Armbruster	Betty Booher	Gary Charavalli
Fred Armstrong	Soo Borson	Wen Chiu
Virginia L Ashley	Pamela T. Bowe	Ke-Sang Chun
Steve & Karen Ashurst	Dale Brandenstein & Laura	Bill Clark
John & Martha Askew	McMillan	Sharon & James
Richard & Maureen Astley	Jack Brautigam	Clendenning
Maxine Austin	Marylee Brehm	Jennifer Cobb
Donald R. Axtell	R. Breidenthal	Andrea & Bill Collison
Gail P. Baer	Paul Brown	Diane Collum
Edith Bailey	Sonia Brown	Jim Corcoran
Sherry Baker	Tom Bryan	Frank Corken
Ole Bakken	Teresa Buckland	Kellie A. Cox
Charles V. Barber	Theresa Bunger	Doris Cozine
Michael Barrett	Valarie Bunn	Russell & Mary Cranny
Betty Bartholomew	Gordon Burch	Lee Crouthers
Sarah C. Barnes	Molly Burke	Greg M. Currier
Terry Barton	Rhonda Bushy	Wes Curry
		Deborah Darsie

Nick Davaz	Karen Fant	Carl Grant
Amy Davis	Josey Fast	Gordon & Mary C
Greg Dearholt	Vertie Faucher	Dorothy Gunders
Beth delaFuente	Mary Fellows	Chuck Gustafsc
Tony DelMaestro	JoAnn Fenton & Steve	Carol Guthrie
Marian Demas	Collins	Bill Hadley
Pierre C. Desgranges	Deb & Garth Ferber	Steven P. Hadle
Geneva Devine	Mike Ferro	Ellen Hale
Sandra Dire	Glenda Feyes	Richard Hallberg
Joyce & Rosh Doan	Russ Foisy	Jane Halton
Dorothy Douglas	Anastasia (Stacey)	Donald Hand
Garth C. Douglass	Hopkins Folpe	Ron Hand
Ralph Dreitzler	Dick Foltz	Ellen Harbaugh
David & Pauline Dubois	Albert M. Forget	Paula Hardwick
Laura & Mark DuFresne	Kirk Foster	Barbara Harmon
Nancy Eakright	T. Franklin	James & Laura H
Grace Eckton	Jerri Fredin	Deborah Harris
Jeffrey & Dianne Edfast	Ed Freeman	Dick Harris
Beverly Edson	Eric Friedli	Nancy & Carrol H
Jonathon Eide	Gay Fridley	Amy Harris-Medj
Barbara Eisenstein	Marlin J. Gabbert, AIA	Ed Harrison
Beverly Ellis	David Gaultieri	Lorraine Hartmar
Bob Engle	Lee J. Gerry	Colleen & Jonath
Tosha Engstrom	F. Geyer	Hartung
Evelyn Erickson	David Ghoddousi	Jack Hawes
Sheila Espinoza	Fereydun and Susan	Peter Hayes
Judy & Mike Evans	Ghoddousi	Thorn Head
Frank Fadden	Carma & Richard Gies	Harley Heath
Bean Fairbanks	Dave Gilbertson	Lee Heckman
Marilyn Fairbanks	Emily Goertz	Harry Hedlund
Boyd R. and Shirley	Robert Goodnow	Liz Hedreen
Fairchild	Lynne Goree	Tom Heller
Giselle Falkenberg	Jeff Grace	Cathy Helwig

Shiela Hemple	Phyllis Jackson	Tom Knudtson
Diana Hendrickson	Mark Jaeger	Lavonne Kriskov
Richard Hepler	Joel Jelderks & Reenie Duff	Larry LaMotte
Kendra Hernandez	Cindy Jenkins	Steve Land
John Herrity	Pam Jernegan	Rick Lane
Will Hickman	Carol Johnson	Raoul & Virginia Lanning
Edward R. Hill	Dan Johnson	Maxine Larson
Joanne Hjort & Dennis Raymond	Leon Johnson	Elaine LaTourelle
Jessie Hobart	J.A. Johnson	Tauno Latvala
Susan Hofacker	Lloyd Gar Johnson	Randy Lavigne
Dianne J. Hofbeck	Norman S. Johnson	Rosie Leadley
Paula Hoffman	Sara Johnston	Peter Lee
Cathy & Lee Holden	Tom Jordan	Sue Leisy
Corey Holmes & Jim Anderson	Teresa Judge	Kasha Leptich
Jenifer Holmes	Margaret Karagiannis	Neal Lessenger
Dianne Holterman	Pamela Keene	Mark Leth
John Homavand	Nancy Keith	Irma Levine
Elbert J. Honeycutt	Rolfe Kellor	Adele Levy
William D. Hoover	Phil Kendrick-Jones	Steve L. Liming
Pat Howard	Kerman Kermoade	Chu Yao Lin
Nina Hoyt	David Keyt	Ted Lindbeck
Gary Huie	Reza Khastou	Catherine Link
Lorraine Hulett	Erika D. Kiefer	Dana P. Linn
Catherine Hurd	Christina Kilday	Penny Livingston
Kenneth Humch	Cal King	Corissa Logan
Julie Hutchinson	Sally Kinney	Barry Lucas
Katherine Hutchinson	Karen Klepper	Peter Lukevich
Eric Hwee	Cheryl Klinker	Cliff & Pat Lunneborg
Walter M. Isaac	Clyde Knapp	Lynn Lusson
Ann Jack	Sally Knodell	Gladys D. Lybarger
Craig & Elizabeth Jackman	Mary Knox	Carol MacIlroy
	Skip Knox	Edward Mack

Mark Magallanes	Sarah Mitchell	Erilca Peterson
Lynn Magnuson	Tim Mitchell	Linda Peterson
Walter L. Marshall	Vic Mix	Timmie Peterson
Barbara Martin	Esta Modian	Anne & Bruce Pie
Don Martin	Chris Moore	Fran Philbin
Vicki Martinez	Tusin J. Moore	Therese Phipps
Yolanda Martinez	Dale & Carol Morrison	Kelli Pierce
Linda Massey	Jim Mullan	Aileen Pruiksma
Joseph Massimino Jr.	John Munari, Jr.	Bill Pierre, Jr.
Bernie Matsuno	Jerry Murphy	Jamie Pierre
David L. Mattson	Sandra Murray	Mike Putnam
Mary Lou Maybee	Jim Musar	Denise Radow
Celeste & Steve McArthur	Nancy Nead	Carl Rank
Mildred McCormick	Stephanie Neffner	Mickey Rashkov
Susan McDaniel	Tom Nesbitt	J. Kenneth Rechr
Jeanne McDonnell	Dale & Jack Nielsen	Mike Reinhardt
Sylvie McGee	Debbie Newton	Pamela Rhoads
Dick McGuire	Carol Nilsen	Dana Rice
William M. McKee	Maureen A O'Neill	Jon Richardson
Jean McLan	Allan Orr	David W. Richard
J. McPhee (Judy)	Roy Ovenell	Robert M. Richar
Karen Meadows	Anne Paisley	J. Kenneth Richr
Christian & Kelly Meinig	Dolores D. Palacpac	Sandra Riggins
Marci Melvin	Steve Palay & Kathryn	Kathleen Riley
Dale & Joan Mendenhall	Rahn	Joseph C. Rinaldi
Tom & Judy Merchant	Timothy D. Panichi	E.F. Ted Robinso
Rick Meyer	Clayton & Susan Park	Ray Robinson
Rob Meyer	Jennyfer Parker-Schuler	Walt Robinson
Don Miller	Corrie Payne	Paul Robisch
R. Millinger	Charles Payton	Brad Rodgers
Kathleen Milne	Mary Peltier	Lisa Rogers
Ed Minshull	Ann Peterson	Payricia A. Rognli
	Mrs. Cleo Peterson	

Brooke & Mary Rolston	Joyce Smith	Dr. Arnold Tamarin
Helen Rosmith	Pamela M. Smith	Lori Taylor
Julie Rotary	Suzy Smith	Mason Taylor
Helen M. Rushton	Bill Sosusthern	Scott Taylor
Samir Rustagi	Kevin Spath & Delia Tapp	Levia & Mark Terrell
Diane Saas	Tim Spearbeck	Ronda Thomas
Elaine Schmidt	Rod Spencer	Heidi Thomassen
Mary Schneider	Charlotte Spizman	Vibha Thompson
Fayla Schwartz	Mary Springer	Kristi Thorndike
Patricia Schwartz	Clint Staaf	JoAnn Tramm
Michele Seesee	Kethleen Stack & Pavel	C. Lee Tracy
Bill & Kathy Sellars	Mazac	B.A. TreziseMary
Jeff & Michelle Sellentin	Cheryl & Miles Standish	Trubshaw
Judy Dodlim Shafer	Pat Starkovich	Nancy Turner
Emily Shanks	Mike Steckler	Oliver Tuthill
Deejah, Ron, Sven & Huw	Pete & MaryJane Steele	Duane Tyson
Sherman-Peterson	Sally & Mark Stefanich	Vic Uhrich
Jenny Shibayann	Cheryl & David Steiner	Mary Van Court
Stephen Shipper-t	Virginia & Louis Sternberg	Eve Van Rennes
Kevin Shirely	Judy Sterry	Roy & Sheila Vallejo
Clara Silver	David Stetner	Eve Van Rennes
Tom Simpson	Ellen Stewart	Janine VanSanden
Sara Singer	Sarah Steward & Kari	Maryelva Varhley
A. J. Skurdal	Sellars	Robin Vea
Helen Slabaugh	Vicki Stiles	Oscar Verlo
Nick Slepko	Erik Stockdale	Pat Vetter
Nancy Slocum	James Strom	Darrel Vorderstrasse
Bob Smadt	Mark Stults	Hal Vosburg
Marcia Smallman	Rolando Suarez	Jerry L. Vosburg
Kim & Greg Smallwood	Lesley Sullivan	Bob Vreeland
Reid & Emily Smith	Peter Steinbrueck	Beverly Rich Wakefield
Vicki Smith	Dale Summers	Andrea Wallace
Brian Smith	Anne L. Szatrowski	J. Warner

Carol Warren	Hiller West	Mary Wilson
Dan Wasell	Cassie A Whinihan	Pamela S. W
Ann Watkins	Julie Willaford	Duane Wright
Melodi Watson	Doris Williams	Elaine K. You
Doron Weisbarth	Vickie J. Williams	Andy Zavada
Marjorie Wenrig	Sandra Williamson	Susan Zeller
John Wells	David Wilson	Darleen D. Ze

3.5 INDEX

15" AVE NE.....	.8, 18, 46, 80, 83, 84, 87
19 th AVENE.....	.8, 15, 63, 83, 85, 88, 167
30" AVE NE.....	40, 64, 84
33 rd AVE NE.....	79
35 th AVE NE.....	17, 79
Bicycles.....	11, 20, 21, 24, 42, 85
Boundary.....	109, 111, 112, 113
Burke Gilman trail	85
Cedar Park8, 16, 17, 50, 53, 62, 63, 85, 104, 107
Cedar Park school	16
Civic Core.....	11, 12, 16, 20, 21, 29, 31, 33, 35, 39, 50, 51, 59, 83, 87, 104, 105, 106, 107, 115, 116, 118, 119
civic involvement.....	19, 40
commercial district.....	6, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 34, 37, 42, 44, 54, 61, 63, 86, 117, 119
community center.....	.6, 11, 14, 15, 16, 29, 33, 41, 60, 104
Crime, Public Safety.....	1, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 28, 35, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 54, 62, 63, 82, 86, 87, 88, 104, 105, 107, 116, 117, 119
Curb bulb	22
curbs.....	14, 21, 28, 31, 33, 35, 44, 59, 107, 117, 118
Davis Park.....	104
Design Review.....	19, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 44, 57, 59, 88, 116, 117, 118
fire station.....	16, 29, 33, 46
garden	51, 105, 106
Gateway Plan.....	.6, 14, 19, 29, 31, 60, 61, 119
Green Streets.....	24, 50
Homewood Park49, 53, 104, 106
HUV, Hub Urban Village.....	6, 8, 11, 16, 22, 34, 35, 38, 39, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 83, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 117, 118
John Rogers school.....	16, 53
Lake City.....	6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 41, 44, 45, 49, 50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 76, 78, 79, 80, 82, 86, 87, 88, 89, 104, 105, 106, 107, 117, 119
Lake City Park	53, 104
Lake City Way.....	12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 31, 34, 35, 37, 38, 49, 61, 76, 78, 79, 80, 104, 105, 106, 107, 119
library.....	6, 11, 14, 15, 16, 22, 29, 33, 58, 60
Little Brook Creek.....	.49, 105, 106, 107
Maple Leaf.....	16, 64
Meadowbrook.....	.8, 16, 50, 59, 62, 63, 64, 104, 105
Monorail	22, 24, 28, 57
Multi-family.....	50, 117
Nathan Hale High School	16, 59, 104
Natural Systems	17, 46

NE 145' Street	7, 8, 12, 20, 3
NE 95 th Street	
NE 98" Street	8, 15, 63, 7
Northgate Way	
Olympic Hills	8, 16, 50, 62, 6
Open spaces	7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 22, 28, 29, 33, 34, 38, 45, 49, 50, 51, 53, 59, 63, 79, 82, 86, 88, 104, 106, 107, 108, 116, 118, 119
Parking	83, 10
pedestrian..	14, 20, 24, 83, 10
Pedestrian Ways	14, 20, 24, 78, 80, 81, 83, 106, 10
Pinehurst..	8, 50,
plaza	11, 16, 33, 104, 10
post office..	16, 21,
Sacajawea.....	8,
Sandpoint Way	
Schools	16, 78, 79, 80,
SEPA	
Single family	
Thornton Creek	17, 29, 46, 49, 53, 61, 10.
transit..	11, 14, 19, 20, 21, 24, 26, 28, 33, 39, 50, 56, 57, 8.
Validation..	61
Victory Heights	8, 62, 64
watershed..	17, 19, 1
wheelchair	
Youth programs	
zoning	7, 29, 4

PART 4 -APPENDICES

4.1 1995 SURVEY AND RESULTS

In September of 1994 an application was submitted for Department of Neighborhood Matching Funds in the amount of \$25,510. This proposal was for community outreach and education efforts. Matching contributions included \$16,270 in professional services and \$20,140 in non-professional services, totaling over 2,400 hours of volunteer effort. The grant was intended to fund: 1) a survey of households, businesses, and landowners within the working boundaries of the planning effort; 2) a public meeting; and 3) preparation of a document compiling the results of the survey, to be used as a springboard for continuing planning efforts. In December of 1994, the steering committee was informed that they had been granted the full \$25,510.

Throughout the months of planning and grant application, support was provided by both the Department of Neighborhoods and the (then) Department of Planning. The Department of Neighborhoods provided technical assistance in the preparation of grant applications, mostly through Mary Lynn Jensen; and encouragement from Jim Diers, Director. The Department of Planning assigned Dotty DeCoster as Project Manager for many neighborhoods in the North End. Throughout the process, Dotty has regularly attended steering committee meetings and provided valuable assistance in working with various city departments and information systems.

In the last months of 1994, three committees were formed. The Survey Drafting Committee put many hours into the difficult task of developing a questionnaire to be mailed to the entire community. The Outreach Committee began working on ways to ensure that members of the community who might not respond to a mailed questionnaire be given opportunities to contribute their opinions. The Publicity/Education Committee made plans to ensure that community members became aware not only of this planning effort, but also of the importance of responding to the survey.

In 1995 and 1996, the Planning Steering Committee gathered input from a broad spectrum of the community. A variety of public meetings and workshops provided community members with opportunities both to learn about the planning effort and contribute to that effort. A mailing of 16,400 survey packets provided a parallel opportunity, and invited community members to participate in future planning activities. Community consultations were conducted to reach people considered unlikely to respond to mailed questionnaires, focusing on low-income households, multi-family renters, and those who were elderly, disabled, and for whom English was a second language. Following is a presentation of the methodology and results associated with the survey and community consultations.

METHODOLOGY

Survey

Early in 1995, the Survey Drafting Committee began working to design a questionnaire. Issues identified in the 1993 informal survey and the 1994 meel were included, and new issues were identified. Although the committee **contac** eight consultants in an effort to get professional help in designing the survey,. n of the parties contacted were interested in doing the job for the amount of **mon** that was available. After continued informal recruitment, however, a consultant hired to provide information and guidance to the group during a single two-hour session. Two draft questionnaires were pre-tested by the Planning Steering Committee. The final versidn was then prepared for distribution.

The City of Seattle provided a mailing list of all residents, property owneis, and businesses within the working boundaries of the planning effort. That list was divided into five sectors: the proposed Hub Urban Village, plus the four sectors produced by dividing the remaining area by Lake City Way and Northeast 125th Street. The questionnaires were color-coded so that returned surveys from **each** sector could be identified easily. In addition, random samples were identified a tracked from each sector. These random sample survey packets contained questionnaires that in addition to color coding were also labeled according to p number, sector number, and census tract block number. The colors and **mailing** label identifiers facilitated coding and analysis of the survey responses, and ma relatively easy to perform follow-up on the random samples.

In addition to the questionnaires, the mailing packets included:

- 1) cover letter with acknowledgments;
- 2) "Preparing to Plan" - a summary of issues for volunteer solicitation;
- 3) volunteer response postcards;
- 4) map of planning area showing neighborhoods included and listing, on the reverse, local community councils and organizations.

An additional follow-up postcard was sent to the random sample constituents to encourage them to return their surveys and other information.

At this point, a new committee, the Data Analysis Committee, began evaluating responses. This included coding responses, collating, organizing, and **analyzing** the results.

Rating-scale responses were coded using a Likert scale (ranging from -5, very dissatisfied, to **+5**, very satisfied) and the data were entered into a computer an formatted as a spread sheet. This enabled us to generate line and bar graphs. Written comments were categorized; each category was assigned a number; ar the responses were entered into the computer so they could be visually **display** as bar graphs.

Community Consultations

Three community consultation sessions were held to gather input from people particularly hard to reach through the survey and other outreach efforts. These sessions focused on special populations from the following groups: low-income residents; multi-family renters; and people who were elderly, disabled, and for whom English was a second language. The objectives of these consultations were: to reach members of the community who had not participated in the planning effort; to provide information about the goals and process of the planning effort; and to determine factors that contribute to low participation. Each session lasted approximately one and a half hours. A 20 minute introduction of the planning effort was followed by over an hour of discussion among participants who, in each session, talked about issues that interested and concerned them.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Survey

Because an unknown number of addresses in the mailing list were duplicated, the mailing reached fewer than 16,400 addresses. However, based on the total of 16,400 packets sent out, the overall response rate for questionnaires was approximately nine percent (over 1400 returned). In addition, approximately 300 people returned postcards indicating that they wanted to volunteer and an additional 400 asked to be kept informed of our progress.

In the random samples (for which follow-up mailing were performed) the response rate was 14 percent. Addresses of respondents to the random sample were plotted on a map of the survey area, and revealed a fairly even distribution throughout the area (see Attachment D). The single exception to this was the Northwest sector, which appeared to be slightly under-represented. Random sample responses were similar to responses to the larger mailing, therefore analyses and presentation of data includes all responses.

A. What Do You Like Best; What Should be Changed?

The first two questionnaire items asked what two things were liked best and what two things should be changed in the respondent's neighborhood. Two sets of concerns ranked very highly throughout the survey area. When asked what two things are liked best about neighborhoods, neighborhood qualities such as single family residential character, residential views and rural **feeling were** important.

When asked "What two things would you most like to change about your neighborhood?", traffic conditions and conditions for walking / bike were most frequently cited. In addition, in a ranking described below, "traffic" and "streets and sidewalks" were the only issues where more than 50 percent of respondents were dissatisfied.

B. Like&scale questions

Twelve issues were presented for ranking by respondents along a scale from minus 5 (worst ranking) through 0 (no opinion) to plus 5 (best ranking). For this summary the responses are divided into three categories: Satisfied (all positive rankings),

Dissatisfied (all negative rankings), and No Opinion (all zero rankings). In **Figure 1** the twelve issues are shown in descending order of percentage of dissatisfied respondents.

Figure 1 - 1995 Planning Questionnaire - Overall Responses

- 1 Streets and Sidewalks
- 2 Traffic
- 3 Lake City
- 4 Shopping & Professional Services Along Lake City Way
- 5 Crime
- 6 Parks and Open Space
- 7 Schools
- 8 Sense of Community
- 9 Public Transportation
- 10 Social Services
- 11 Shopping & Professional Services Along 15th Avenue
- 12 Public Facilities

The method chosen for sorting the mailing list by sector was effective for four of five sectors, but addresses sorted and coded as falling within the boundaries of the proposed Hub Urban Village turned out to be scattered throughout the planning area. Therefore, at present no good data are available for residents within the proposed boundaries of the Hub Urban Village. In an effort to use all available data, the labels on random-sample responses located within the proposed boundaries of the Hub Urban Village were examined for parcel numbers and placed accordingly into one of the four remaining sectors.

Some issues generated notable differences among the four sectors, while responses on other issues were similar for all sectors. The issues generating most dissatisfaction overall also generated most dissatisfaction in each sector. (These were also the things most respondents wanted to change.) "Streets and Sidewalks" and "Traffic" generated high percentages of dissatisfied respondents in all four sectors of the planning area. This dissatisfaction ranged from 52 percent of respondents in Southwest to 64 percent in Northeast for streets and sidewalks; and from 50 percent in Southeast to 63 percent in Northeast for traffic.

Appearance and characteristics of the Lake City area were unsatisfactory for most respondents from Northeast, Southeast, and Southwest sectors; but respondents from Northwest sector split slightly in favor of satisfaction regarding this question. Lake City appearance ranked fifth as a "top concern" and fifth as an area where volunteer effort is needed.

With regard to shopping and services available along Lake City Way, satisfied respondents outnumbered dissatisfied respondents north of 125th Street (45 to 31 percent in Northeast and 41 to **25 percent** in Northwest), but the reverse was true

south of 125th Street (35 to 41 percent in Southeast and 32 to 37 percent in Southwest).

Respondents from south of 125th Street expressed general satisfaction with "Crime" (47 percent satisfied in Southeast and 43 percent satisfied in Southwest), while those north of 125th were predominately dissatisfied (40 percent dissatisfied in each sector). Crime also ranked high (fourth) in unsolicited comments and first in the percentage of respondents saying a volunteer effort is needed.

A similar split, though more pronounced, was evident in responses related to "Parks and Open Space." Southeast (60 percent) and Southwest (55 percent) sector respondents expressed general satisfaction with while Northwest (44 percent) and Northeast (52 percent) sector respondents were predominately dissatisfied. In comments from throughout the survey area, however, respondents indicated a need for more parks and open space closer to residents.

Regarding "Schools," in all four sectors, respondents with no opinion outnumbered both satisfied and dissatisfied respondents. In fact, in three sectors more than half the respondents had no opinion. The Southwest sector produced relatively more satisfied respondents (28 percent), while Northeast, Northwest, and Southeast sectors produced more dissatisfied respondents 28, 24, and 33 percent, respectively). When respondents with children in the household were examined separately, the "no opinion" group shrank in every sector, but remained larger than satisfied or dissatisfied in Northeast and Northwest. In the Southeast dissatisfaction predominated, and in the Southwest satisfaction predominated.

Generally favorable responses, ranging from 37 to 47 percent satisfied respondents, were received from throughout the survey area with regard to "Sense of Community".

"Public Facilities" and "Public Transportation" also drew generally favorable responses from throughout the survey area. Satisfied respondents ranged from 54 percent (Southwest) to 67 percent (Southeast) for public facilities and from 48 percent (Southeast) to 61 percent (Southwest) for public transportation)

Social Services" drew predominately "no opinion" from all four sectors. Of those with an opinion, satisfied respondents outnumbered dissatisfied in every sector except Northeast, where the split was 17 percent satisfied, 22 percent dissatisfied, 61 percent no opinion.

"No opinion" respondents predominated east of Lake City Way, but in every sector those expressing satisfaction outnumbered those expressing dissatisfaction with regard to shopping and services along 15th Avenue NE.

C. Volunteer Solicitation

305 volunteer postcards were returned. These fell into issue categories as follows. Most people volunteered for more than one issue.

Sense of Community	120
Green Places	114
Urban Villages	98

Crime & Public Safety	92
Future Growth	79
Getting Around	78
Protecting What's Here	73
Schools	58
Shopping & Services	46
Getting Help	23
Other (25 assigned above)	46
- Lake City Appearance	7
- Kids' Stuff	6
- Other Unassigned -	8

It is interesting to note that although "Sense of Community," generated **mostly** "satisfied" responses to the questionnaire, it drew more volunteers than any other topic, and tied for second as an item worthy of a volunteer effort.

D. Is Neighborhood Volunteer Effort or Activity Needed?

To the right of each of the twelve questionnaire items, respondents were offered opportunity to indicate whether a volunteer planning effort was needed with regard to that issue by checking "yes" or "no" in a shaded box. As Figure 15 indicates, over the planning area most survey respondents did not check either option, making no response. The only exception to this general rule was with regard to "Parks and Open Space", where 52 percent responded. Figure 15 shows responses to the twelve questions in order from highest percentage of "yes" answers to lowest.

Figure 15 - Is Neighborhood Volunteer Effort or Activity Needed?

1	Crime
2	Sense of Community
3	Parks and Open Space
4	Streets and Sidewalks
5	Lake City
6	Traffic
7	Schools
8	Shopping & Professional Services Along Lake City Way
9	Social Services
10	Public Facilities
11	Public Transportation
12	Shopping & Professional Services Along 15th Avenue

Interest in a volunteer effort with regard to "Parks and Open Space" was primarily in the Northeast Sector, where 64 percent of respondents indicated their preference, with 46 percent of them wanting a volunteer effort with regard to "Parks and Open Space."

Space.” In Southeast Sector 52 percent of respondents indicated a preference, 34 percent wanting a volunteer planning effort.

In only the Northeast Sector a majority of respondents also indicated a preference with regard to “Traffic” and “Streets and Sidewalks”. Regarding “Traffic” 55 percent responded with 37 percent wanting a volunteer planning effort (see Figure 17). Regarding “Streets and Sidewalks” 54 percent responded with 37 percent wanting a volunteer planning effort (see Figure 18).

E. Demographics

A portion of the survey asked questions about the respondents’ demographic characteristics and housing. These questions permitted analysis of the extent to which, the survey respondents reflect the demographics of the neighborhood in general. As might be expected with a good response rate, the full range of demographic options was represented.

Specifically, respondents live in both multi-family and single-family housing, have resided here for varying periods of time, represent households of all sizes, come from all four major ethnic groups as well as other categories, and cross the age spectrum. The respondents did, generally, reflect the population of the survey area as measured by the 1990 U.S. census.

There were aspects of our respondent sample which differed from demographic data (according to the 1990 census) by more than ten percent:

Over-represented

- Ages 45 to 64
- Lived in neighborhood five years or more
- Living in single-family residence;

Under-represented

- Ages 25 to 34
- Living in neighborhood less than five years
- Living in multi-family housing
- Single-person households.

Community Consultations

The community consultation meetings were held as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Attendees</u>
2/26/96	Jackson Park Village	16
2/28/96	Lake City House and Village	13
3/28/96	Remington Place Retirement Center	42

Each community consultation session resulted in a variety of comments on issues related to transportation, open space, safety, sense of community, and other concerns. These comments were concordant with those of questionnaire respondents (see Attachment E). Participants in the community consultation groups were invited to participate with other volunteers in subsequent planning efforts.

CONCLUSION

A successful outreach effort informed the planning process about the issue of transportation importance to the residents, property owners, and businesses in the planning area. After two years of preparatory work by individual citizens and by various committees, the community-at-large had now been involved in this planning process for about a year: Approximately 16,000 households were notified about the process, and several hundred individuals participated, either through volunteer efforts or by attending public meetings or community consultation sessions. As a result of the process, new leadership evolved, and relationships with government agencies were strengthened.

Overall, respondents to the survey and participants in community consultation sessions were concerned about the following issues: traffic, streets and sidewalks, crime, having parks and open spaces close to residences, and the appearance of the Lake City area. Respondents reported that they liked the rural feeling and the single-family residential character of their neighborhoods, public facilities and transportation, and the sense of community within neighborhoods. There was a consensus on the issue of schools.

4.2 1996 SURVEY AND RESULTS

After several months of volunteer work on the issues established by the 1995 survey, a questionnaire was developed to determine which specific projects people were willing to work on. It was mailed in May 1996 to the 942 persons who had responded to the previous survey. The following table summarizes the response, indicating by planning area quadrant which projects respondents were willing to work on.

Project	NE	NW	SE	S W	Other
1. Bicycle/Pedestrian Paths	2	2	9	1	
2. Arterials/Peak Hour Diversion	4	1	5	1	
3. Street Improvement Demo Project	1		4	1	
4. Key Intersections or Street Segments	2		4	1	1
5. Parking Study					1
6. Continuous Sidewalks on LC Way		1	3	3	
7. HUV Designation/Boundaries	2	1	2	2	
8. Development Council	2	1	4	2	
9. Image Building	4	2	7	2	
10. Civic Core	1	1	2	2	
11. Community-based Solutions		1	4		
12. Employment Job Bank	1			2	
13. Volunteer Bank/Training Center	1			2	
14. Green Spaces/Open Spaces	2	1	8	2	1
15. Community Use of Schools		3	4	2	
16. Community Newsletter	3	1		1	
17. Community Directory	1				
18. Arts Commission/Arts Center	1	2		2	
19. Local History	3	4	2	1	
20. Neighborhood Fair & Activities	1		2		
21. Community Activities		1	1	1	
22. Shuttle Service			1	1	

23. Housing			3	1	
24. Human Services Infrastructure		1	2	1	
25. Community Centers of Activities		2	1	1	
26. Involving More People in Planning		1		2	
27. Facilitator Training for Study Groups	2		1		
28. Plan for Fall Public Meeting			2	3	
29. Join in Planning Committee	5	4	9	5	1
30. Will donate Professional Services	1	2	4	3	
TOTAL	15	13	30	12	3
Can't help now, keep me informed	5	5	7	6	1

☒ Responses from people: 1) living outside the Planning Area, 2) using a PO address, or 3) who did not provide an address.

4.3 1997 SURVEY AND RESULTS

In the fall of 1997 all residents, businesses and property owners in the North District Neighborhoods' Planning Area received a survey asking specifically what should be done to improve our community. More than 400 persons took the time to respond. This report itemizes and summarizes what a first look at those survey responses tells us.

Cedar Park Associates, our data entry and analysis consultants, compiled the responses and looked for correlations. As a first screen, volunteers Kelly Meinig and A.J. Skurdal organized the data according to strength of sentiment, looking for either 60 percent or more of respondents agreeing or 60 percent or more of respondents disagreeing with mentioned possibilities. There were 243 scaled variables on the survey. Of these 243 variables, 127 prompted 60% or more of respondents to either agree or disagree. Work groups and the Planning Committee will be certain to consider these "preference" items as we develop a draft Neighborhood Plan for public and city review.

Of course, not every one who sent back a survey completed every item of the survey. One practical effect of the "60 percent" test is that at least 137 respondents must have indicated a preference one way or another for that item to be considered further. In fact, all but three items passed this test with more than 150 respondents indicating a preference.

Other study and analysis of survey results will ensue. For example, we may want to look at items where a simple majority agree or disagree, with low percentages of respondents in opposition. Results for the first look, the "60 percent test," are given in this report. The survey was divided into sections, which are matched in this report.

Transportation and Getting Around

Respondents gave 132 mentions of traffic control measures they think are needed. The most popular single response was to the effect "no traffic problems," with 22 such respondents. They were followed closely by 19 folks who wanted more traffic circles and 17 other folks who want no more circles and/or to remove some of the existing circles.

Respondents also gave 177 mentions of specific locations where traffic control or traffic calming measures may be needed. The "Getting Around" work group has been taking traffic counts throughout the planning area, and will be incorporating respondent suggestions into their deliberations as we work towards a cohesive **traffic** management plan.

Regarding public transit, respondents agreed on a need to increase bus frequency to downtown Seattle and to improve quality of bus stops.

Regarding bicycle routes, respondents were interested in better access to the Burke **Gilman** trail and marked lanes on arterial streets.

In descending order of strength of sentiment, the following criteria were **end** for building sidewalks: streets with high traffic volumes, streets along walking to schools, streets near businesses, streets with bad sight distances, streets high density living (e.g. apartment buildings), streets with drainage problems making it difficult to walk, streets with ditches, streets near parks, and streets traffic flow measures.

Green and Open Spaces

Use of school fields as community, multiple use areas after school hours **dre** strongest response of any survey item, with 286 respondents indicating extreme agreement. Only 11 respondents indicated any disagreement with this idea. respondents agreed that field lighting should be provided for activities in evening hours.

Natural/wild spaces, grassy open parks and children's play areas were the top types of open space respondents agreed are needed. In addition, bioswales vegetative filtering of water were viewed as favorable uses of open space and suitable requirements for installation within parking areas.

Respondents said they would not use pop-up patches or a farmers' market to produce and sell goods, but would shop at a farmers' market. Finally, respondents **wanted** to see the Lake City Community Center improved to allow for a greater variety of uses.

Crime and Public Safety

All of the ideas offered in the survey for improving public safety in both residential areas and the business district (anti-graffiti efforts, improved sidewalks, additional police presence, improved lighting, beautification, and improved litter control) had strong agreement except using video camera monitoring of shopping and business areas, where only 51% of respondents agreed and 24% were neutral.

Shopping & Services in Lake City

Only three of the types of Lake City businesses listed in the survey are used by 60% or more of respondents: grocery, automotive and coffee shops. Respondents wanted to see more of three other businesses: theaters/entertainment, hardware and restaurants. Respondents felt the following things would make shopping in Lake City a more positive experience and increase the likelihood of their return: improved image, greater variety of services/businesses, more shopping on side streets and friendly alleys, and easier pedestrian access.

The following niches all appeal to respondents as possibilities for how Lake City should become known (listed in order of decreasing passion): fresh market/produce, walking zones in business areas, restaurants, plant nurseries, family activities, evening entertainment, and outdoor recreation. They did not want Lake City to become known and/or to draw people for automotive.

On increasing our sense of community, respondents felt the following things would help (again listed in order of decreasing passion): stronger restrictions on billboard size and placement, trees along the main streets, park and street benches, street

fronts on friendly alleys (like Post Alley), hanging plant/flower baskets, flowers in median strips, wide sidewalks. stronger restrictions on neon sign usage, and artwork (e.g. wall murals).

Respondents liked the idea of using natural features as a symbol or theme for Lake City.

Future Growth

Townhouses were acceptable to respondents to accommodate future growth, whereas 3, 4 or 5 story apartment units were not. This is an example of the kind of preference which may not be amenable to much influence by neighborhood planning, since much land in the Lake City core area is already zoned for 45, 65 and 85 foot heights. Single family zoning, on the other hand, can be protected.

Most respondents had heard of the Hub Urban Village concept, and all six of the possible benefits of accepting the designation would convince most respondents to do so. Among perceived disadvantages that would be unacceptable, higher density was most frequent, with 42 mentions. Other mentions included traffic (28), controlling outsiders (23), poor design/construction (15), and multifamily residences (12).

The survey asked what folks are willing to do to learn more about the Hub designation proposed in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan. This item drew the lowest response rate to pass the "60 percent test." Respondents were willing to read informational materials delivered to their home; and attend a short, evening information meeting in their neighborhood. Respondents were not willing to attend a half day workshop or seminar on a weekend. Of the 186 respondents who indicated a preference on this item, 80 percent were willing to do something to learn more about the designation prior to making a decision about accepting or rejecting it.

Schools

The survey asked how schools and neighborhoods can be mutually supportive. Respondents agreed with the following ideas (in decreasing order of passion): after school activities for students, better sidewalks leading to schools, after school programs for community, increased safety on routes to schools, improved grounds maintenance/landscaping, play grounds improved, playing fields improved, structural improvements to school buildings, increased security, and libraries open to the public in evenings.

Lake City's Civic Core

Of the ideas for additional services and activities to improve the community, the following drew responses in agreement: activities for youth; activities for seniors; a larger, more comprehensive Community Center in Lake City; a teen center, a multi-purpose gymnasium, and volunteer coordination.

In the larger planning area, respondents wanted a movie theater, greater restaurant variety, and sidewalk cafes. They did not want high tech game rooms or an automobile museum.

Respondents felt services for teenagers need to be improved.

Unpleasant walking in the core area was attributed to: lack of sidewalks on **bac** streets, no clear boundaries between automobiles and pedestrians, unsafe fee: when crossing streets, traffic moving too fast in proximity to sidewalks, no good central places to park a car safely and then walk, and no landscaping to buffer pedestrians from cars.

Design guidelines were viewed favorably to help guarantee a consistent design character and style in the Lake City Business District.

Overview

This section let respondents tell us what areas need the most Attention. Respondents agreed with the following (descending order of passion): sidewalk improving green & open spaces, security and public safety, maintenance.

General

This section informed us about general characteristics of the respondents. More respondents reside in the Southeast sector of the planning area than any other - 46%, SW - 25%, NE - 12%, NW - 17%). Other respondent characteristics, compared to 1990 Census data for the planning area, are as follows.

	1997 Respondents	1990 Area Popula
Living in planning area		
less than five years	31%	52%
more than five years	69%	48%
Rent home	10%	46%
Own home	90%	54%
Single family residence	81%	58%
Non-single family	19%	42%
Households, one person	18%	36%
More than one person	82%	64%
Avg persons/household	2.5	2.1

Households with children	27%	20%
Households w/o children	73%	80%
White, non-Hispanic	87%	82%
Non-white	13%	18%

Most survey respondents (72%) do not anticipate moving in the next one to three years. Varying degrees of satisfaction with residence in percent location were expressed by 95% of respondents, with the biggest portion (48%) being very satisfied. For those who do anticipate moving, the most common reason (16 responses) was for a better neighborhood, followed by a bigger house (9 responses). Most respondents (81%) do not work within the planning area.

One Word Description of Lake City

In response to a request for a one word description of Lake City, the most frequent comment (31 responses) was "run down." Or perhaps it should be spelled "rundown." Of 341 responses to this item, about 44% were negative in nature, 32% positive. Respondents who indicated they might move within the next one to three years were significantly less satisfied with their location and were more likely to describe Lake City in negative terms.

contributors to this summary, in addition to the 401 survey respondents, include Sally Knodell, Kelly Meinig, Cheryl Klinker, Linda Peterson, and Penny Livingston.

4.4 1997 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SURVEY AND RESULTS